



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that in the end chosen by the Hedonist as (in his view) reasonable, reason is not, in a certain sense, "included in the end."

If I do not mistake Mr. Bradley's meaning, Hedonism, as I understand it, includes all that he would demand. For, the very clear and explicit statements of his as to the worth of pleasantness, which have been already quoted, seem to me to exclude the attribution of *ultimate* and *intrinsic* worth to anything except *happy life as the end approved by reason*,—though no doubt everything which in any way or degree contributes to that end has its own worth and its own place, and though no means or conditions of the end can be excluded.

I can only hope that in this hasty attempt to answer Mr. Bradley's remarks I have not misunderstood or misrepresented any of his statements, the meaning of which appears to me to be very clear.

E. E. C. JONES.

GIRTON COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

BOOK REVIEWS.

MAN AND WOMAN: A Study of Human Secondary Sexual Characters. By Havelock Ellis. 8vo. London: Walter Scott, 1894. Pp. xiv. + 409. Illustrated.

When we generalize in regard to social questions we assume that there is a measure of sameness in human kind, and we modify our judgments as we recognize the importance of racial and other differences. But the most fundamental of differences is that between the sexes, which must be taken due account of if our judgments are to have precision. The difference is indeed recognized by us all, but oftener instinctively than rationally, and by many in a manner which betrays ignorant prejudice, or even superstition. At this, however, we cannot wonder, for, even to those who have wished to know, accurate information as to the differences between man and woman has not hitherto been readily accessible. It is so now, thanks to Mr. Havelock Ellis.

The search for an understanding of the differences between man and woman has led some to face the problem of the origin and evolution of sex, but, although something has been gained by

inquiry in this direction, many of the results are still in the speculative stage. Others, again, groping here and there, have fastened eagerly upon some particular fact, or supposed fact, such as that men have heavier brains than women, and have reasoned or acted on the strength of this item,—of course, erroneously. The search has led Mr. Havelock Ellis to a laborious induction, to collect and sift information for a dozen years, and a welcome must be given to the result. For his book is a work of marvellous erudition and unusual carefulness, refreshing in its cautious restraint and in its appreciation of the complexity of the problem. The author is absolutely impartial and undogmatic; he has labored to winnow the wheat of fact from the chaff of inaccuracy; but he has no secret to tell us, no recipe for perfecting the relations between men and women, no general advice except the old one,—that we must base our judgments upon facts, and be sure that we get them, and that we need not try to fight against Nature.

In presenting a brief summary of Mr. Havelock Ellis's more important conclusions, we must notice that they are in no case assertions; they are inductions based on carefully sought-out evidence which in some cases is quite encyclopædic in its fulness. And if it seem that the mass of evidence sometimes yields exceedingly little result, it must be remembered that to show this frankly is part of the author's purpose.

Among primitive peoples, the men are fitted for and undertake work involving violent and brief muscular effort; the women are usually better able for prolonged and more patient exertion. "They are the universal primitive carriers." "The militant side of primitive culture belongs to the men, the industrial to the women." But as the means of subsistence became more secure, and life less militant, men began to take up women's industries, and to specialize them. Nowadays, the artificial sexual differences are being removed, men and women are working together, but there are deep natural differences which seem likely to remain.

The deepest of these differences is that between maleness and femaleness, but the author restricts himself (in purpose, at least) to considering the contrast as it is expressed in secondary sexual characters. "A human secondary sexual character is one which, by more highly differentiating the sexes, helps to make them more attractive to each other," so favoring reproduction. As standards of comparison two are used: on the one hand, the anatomical and physiological characters of the child; on the other hand, the characters of the ape, the savage, and the aged human creature.

As regards growth, three general conclusions are reached: women are more precocious than men; in women there is an earlier arrest of development; as a result of these two facts the proportions of women tend to approach those of small men and of children. "The greater youthfulness of physical type in women is a very radical characteristic, and its influence vibrates to the most remote psychic recesses."

The evolution of the race has implied a growth of brains, and increase in the development of the head; but this demands an expansion and development of the pelvis,—a movement in which women are the natural leaders. Man's skull, contrasted with woman's, is nearer the savage, simian, and senile; woman's is less far removed from the infantile. As to the brain, there is no anatomical or physiological warrant for attributing superiority to either sex, though the reverse will probably be stated for many years to come.

Nor do experiments bear out another popular impression, that women have, on the whole, keener and more delicate sense-perceptions,—an error probably due to confusing sensibility and irritability. For women respond to stimuli, psychic or physical, more readily than men; their vaso-motor and muscular systems are more readily stimulated; in short, women show greater irritability or affectability.

There seems no reason to believe that women are inferior to men in forming accurate sense-judgments, while, when the hand is concerned, they are usually, for obvious reasons, at an advantage. In regard to intellectual impulse, it seems almost impossible to generalize. "The artistic impulse, however, is vastly more spontaneous, more pronounced, and more widely spread among men than among women." While the industries arose in woman's hands, the arts are man's. This is in part traceable to the important fact that man, like other males, shows a greater variational tendency. His curve tends oftener to diverge from the mean.

Woman varies less, but this has its compensations. She remains, as it were, younger. Yet to speak of woman as undeveloped man is altogether misleading. "The infant ape is very much nearer to man than the adult ape; the human infant bears precisely the same relation to his species as the simian infant bears to his." (We think that the author somewhat exaggerates this good point.) Woman is child-like only as genius is child-like. "The progress of our race has been a progress in youthfulness." Man follows woman, the little child leads both.

"Nature, as Humboldt put it, has taken women under her special protection." For as woman has the larger share in the work of securing the continuance of the race, she has a firmer grip of life. Man is, after all, the weaker vessel, but he has compensations.

"A broad and general survey of the secondary sexual phenomena in humanity brings us at last into a very humble and conservative attitude

before the facts of the natural world." Artificial or conventional differences between the sexes arise and disappear, and are replaced by others. But the ancient sexual differences remain, "and it is safer to trust to the conservatism of Nature than to the conservatism of man." But within certain limits the natural differences are modifiable, only the limits can hardly be known until they are reached. The respective fitness of men and of women for certain work or privileges can hardly be tested except by experiment. And we need not fear experiment, for Nature has a broad base. "The world is not so insecurely poised."

Mr. Havelock Ellis has been too cautious to lay himself open to much criticism. But we wish, we hope not ungraciously, to criticise his caution. In the first place, because he has too much restrained himself from practical applications. It may be, as he says, that his investigation does not give the definite solution of definite problems, but it sheds light at least on some, and the people perish for lack of knowledge. In the second place, we think that the author would have strengthened his work by taking more account of the primary constitutional difference between the sexes. For, after all, the big fact is surely that man is a male and woman a female. This is the primary difference, with psychical as well as physiological content,—a difference which began with the Protozoa, and which cannot be understood apart from its pre-human history.

Of course, we see that the author has deliberately refrained from considering this primary contrast, and there may be better reasons for his reserve than we are aware of. But he is not consistent; many of the differences in metabolism which he skilfully expounds are not, even on his own definition, secondary sexual characters. Nor is the greater variational tendency of man, which he justly emphasizes. But we do not wonder that the author could not confine himself to secondary sexual characters; they are so ill-defined.

The matter presents itself thus to our mind. A germ of a certain protoplasmic constitution becomes a male; another germ of a certain other constitution becomes a female. (What originated and determines the difference is another story.) They have much in common,—namely, the general specific characters,—and they have each their sex-peculiarity. This sex-peculiarity is expressed in the development of essential sex-organs, in the growth of important accessories, in correlated trivialities, and in the characteristic physiological and psychological diatheses of the man or woman, so far as these are not artificially induced. Now, among these outcrops or expressions of the constitutional sex-peculiarity

there are many, at various levels, which are of value in mutual attraction or preferential mating. Some of these are called secondary sexual characters. But there are other characters which appear to arise differently, not as necessary outcrops of the particular sex-constitution nor as correlates of such, but as germinal variations which owe their growth and persistence to their utility in mutual attraction. These form another group of secondary sexual characters. In short, what are called secondary sexual characters are of mixed origin. It seems ungrateful to grumble, but we cannot help wishing that so lucid a writer and thinker as Mr. Havelock Ellis had helped us on a little with the ætiology of the problem.

J. ARTHUR THOMSON.

EDINBURGH.

EVOLUTION AND ETHICS AND OTHER ESSAYS. By T. H. Huxley. (Vol. IX. of the Collected Essays.) London: Macmillan & Co., 1894. Pp. xiii., 334.

"The latter (the primitive savage, or man as mere animal) fights out the struggle for existence to the bitter end like any other animal; the former (the ethical man, the member of society or citizen) devotes his best energies to the object of setting limits to the struggle." To this passage, which occurs on page 203 of the present volume in an essay (date 1888) entitled "The Struggle for Existence in Human Society," the author appends a note, "The reader will observe that this is the argument of the Romanes lecture in brief." The Romanes lecture on "Evolution and Ethics" (date 1893), and its prolegomena of 1894, are the papers of chief interest in this volume, and, as the author indicates, carry out the argument of the passage above cited. It would even appear that Mr. Huxley's views are developing in this direction, when we compare the Romanes lecture with the tone of his utterances on "General" Booth's social scheme, which also are here republished. I need not apologize, I believe, to readers of this JOURNAL for treating the antithesis thus stated as the gist of the work before me, which is full, of course, of the familiar excellences of Mr. Huxley's writing, and contains an interesting discussion of capital from the biologist's point of view.

In Plato's analysis of society, it will be remembered, the ethical process is regarded as consciously adopting for its aim the principle which had blindly operated through the whole kingdom of